

Theory of p-wave Pairing for ^3He on Grafoil

Andrey V. Chubukov

Department of Physics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511-8167

and

P.L. Kapitza Institute for Physical Problems, Moscow, Russia

Alexander Sokol

Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,

1110 West Green St., Urbana, IL 61801-3080

and

L.D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Moscow, Russia

The specific heat and susceptibility data for ^3He on Grafoil are analyzed in the framework of the Landau Fermi liquid theory. The dominant interaction between ^3He quasiparticles is found to be in the p-wave channel for most experimentally accessible areal densities of ^3He . This interaction is attractive and gives rise to the p-wave transition temperature which for moderate areal densities is estimated to be on the scale of several millikelvin. The relevance of these results to the anomaly in the specific heat observed at $T_k = 3.2\text{ mK}$ is discussed.

Experiments on monolayer films of ^3He absorbed on Grafoil [1,2,3] and on ^3He - ^4He mixture films on Nucleopore substrate [4,5] provide an opportunity to study in detail the properties of 2D Fermi liquids. Interest in this subject has grown since the validity of the conventional Fermi liquid theory in 2D was questioned in the context of the high- T_c superconductivity [6]. In the present approach, we focus on the 2D Fermi liquid at sufficiently low densities where perturbative calculations [7] do not show any divergencies which might signal the breakdown of the Fermi liquid description. Accordingly, we assume that the Fermi liquid picture is valid for ^3He in two dimensions.

The most remarkable property of bulk ^3He is a superfluidity with nonzero angular momentum $l = 1$ [8]. However, in “surface” ^3He the superfluid transition has not yet been observed. In what follows, we analyze the possibility of superfluidity for ^3He on Grafoil on the basis of information which can be inferred from experiments on specific heat [1] and magnetic susceptibility [3]. We find that for most experimentally accessible densities, this system cannot be described by a momentum independent (i.e., s-wave) interaction. Instead, the dominant interaction component is in the p-wave channel. The corresponding scattering amplitude is attractive so that for moderate densities one might expect to get relatively high $T_c \sim 100\text{mK}$. However, our calculation yields an anomalously small prefactor in the expression for T_c in 2D which shifts the transition down to the millikelvin region. The calculated value of T_c is reasonably close to 3.2 mK, where the specific heat anomaly in ^3He on Grafoil has been observed [1]. We argue that this anomaly may correspond to the onset of superfluidity.

We start with a brief review of the properties of dilute Fermi liquids [9]. At small densities, the s-wave component of the scattering amplitude is dominant. The perturbative expansion holds in powers of the product of the scattering amplitude and the density of states at the Fermi surface, N_0 . In three dimensions $N_0 \propto p_F$ while the s-wave scattering amplitude (scattering length) is normally of the same order as the range of the interaction potential, r_0 . In two dimensions, the density of states N_0 is independent of ρ , but a low density expansion is still possible because the scattering amplitude in 2D tends to zero

logarithmically as $\rho \rightarrow 0$ [10]. Accordingly, the expansion parameter for the 2D problem is $g(\rho) = 1/\log(\rho_0/\rho)$, where $\rho_0 \sim r_0^{-2}$. When $\rho \ll \rho_0$, the expressions for the effective mass m^* and magnetic susceptibility χ in 2D are [11]:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m^*}{m_3} &= 1 + F_1^s \simeq 1 + 2g^2, \\ \frac{\chi}{\chi_3} &= \frac{1 + F_1^s}{1 + F_0^a} \simeq \frac{m^*}{m_3} \left(1 - 2g + 4g^2 \ln 2\right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where m_3 and χ_3 refer to an ideal gas of ^3He atoms.

The experimental data on the density dependence of the specific heat and magnetic susceptibility are presently available for ^3He on Grafoil [1,2,3] and for ^3He - ^4He films on the Nucleopore substrate [4,5]. The latter case is more difficult to analyse because a ^3He atom occupies a surface bound state on top of ^4He and its hydrodynamic mass is substantially larger than the atomic mass of ^3He due to the interaction with underlying ^4He layers [12]. In what follows, we concentrate solely on the properties of the ^3He film on Grafoil. The experimental results for the effective mass [1] along with theoretical predictions for the s-wave and p-wave scattering amplitudes are presented in Fig.1. Although the higher order terms in g may be important for larger densities, it is clear from Fig.1 that the (logarithmic) density dependence of g is too weak to account for the fast increase of the effective mass as density increases. The above discrepancy signals that in the experimentally accessible region of densities the $l=0$ harmonic does not overshadow the higher angular momentum components. In general, in this situation all harmonics should have equal strength. However, we found that the plot of m^*/m versus ρ is well described by a simple fit which involves *only* the p-wave component of the scattering amplitude (Fig.1):

$$\frac{m^*}{m} \approx \left(1 - \frac{\rho}{0.062 \text{ atoms/\AA}^2}\right)^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

The nearly linear behavior of m/m^* as a function of ρ which is seen in the experiments [1] even at relatively small ρ indicates that for ^3He absorbed on Grafoil the p-wave component of the scattering amplitude is anomalously large so that it overshadows the contribution

from the s-wave channel in nearly the entire experimentally accessible range of densities. This fact inspires us to reexamine the low-energy expansion for ^3He on Grafoil.

To proceed with the theoretical description, consider first the case when the Born approximation is valid, i.e. the scattering amplitude coincides with the spin independent interaction potential $U(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k})$. Simple algebra then yields $F^a = -(m^*/2\pi\hbar^2)U(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k})$, $F^s = (m^*/2\pi\hbar^2)(2U(0) - U(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k}))$. Here both $\mathbf{k}'$ and $\mathbf{k}$ are on the Fermi surface, so that $F^{a,s}$ depend only on the angle θ between them. The interaction potential can be expanded at low densities as $U(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k}) = U(0) + \lambda(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k})^2 + \dots = U(0) + 2\lambda p_F^2(1 - \cos\theta) + O(p_F^4)$. This immediately yields the following expressions for the effective mass (same as (2)) and spin susceptibility:

$$\frac{m_3}{m^*} \simeq 1 - \lambda m_3 \rho, \quad \frac{\chi_3}{\chi} \simeq \frac{m_3}{m^*} (1 - 2g - 2\lambda m^* \rho). \quad (3)$$

Leaving the detailed comparison with the experiment to the study of the effects beyond the Born approximation, we merely conclude at this point that in order to account for the increase of the effective mass, λ should be positive so that the pairing interaction in the p-wave channel is attractive [13]. The coupling constant for the p-wave pairing is of the order of $1 - m_3/m^*$. Since the experiment shows that the effective mass may well exceed the bare mass and ϵ_F is nearly 1K, it is not clear *a priori* why no superfluid transition has been observed down to the millikelvin temperature region. To address this issue, we now calculate explicitly the transition temperature in a 2D Fermi gas with p-wave attractive potential and show that the prefactor in T_c is anomalously small in two dimensions.

A way to calculate the prefactor in T_c in a weak coupling approximation is to start with perturbation theory and collect all second order contributions to the pairing vertex which come from the integration over momenta far from the Fermi surface [14]. The renormalized vertex should then be substituted into the Cooper channel and the integration within the ladder should be restricted to a region close to the Fermi surface where the logarithmic term is dominant. By carrying out the above procedure, one obtains an equation for T_c [14]:

$$1 = g(1 + \alpha g) \ln \frac{\epsilon_F}{T_c} + O(g^2), \quad (4)$$

where g is a coupling constant and α is a numerical factor. Solving (4), one gets $T_c = \bar{\epsilon}_F \exp(-1/g)$, where $\bar{\epsilon}_F = \epsilon_F \exp(\alpha)$.

Although for any interaction strength the weak coupling approximation is valid at sufficiently low density, the renormalized p-wave vertex in the Cooper channel $\Gamma(\mathbf{p}, -\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{p}', -\mathbf{p}') \equiv \Gamma(\theta)$ ($\cos \theta = \mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}'/p_F^2$) generally cannot be expressed in terms of a single parameter because the total p-wave scattering amplitude is an unknown nonuniversal quadratic function of the momenta. In other words, unlike for the s-wave case, here one can not substitute the same scattering amplitude into all vertex functions in the second order diagrams which contribute to $\Gamma(\theta)$. In view of this, we first perform the calculation assuming that the Born approximation is valid. Then we reconsider the problem by taking into account some of the effects beyond the Born approximation.

There are four second order diagrams which contribute to $\Gamma(\theta)$. Three of them are from the zero sound channel (Fig.2a-c) while the fourth is from the Cooper channel (Fig.2d). The evaluation of the zero sound diagrams is lengthy but straightforward. We take advantage of the fact that in the region of experimental interest the s-wave component of the interaction is considerably smaller than the p-wave component and neglect $U(0)$, i.e. substitute $U(\mathbf{k}_1\alpha\mathbf{k}_2\beta; \mathbf{k}_3\gamma\mathbf{k}_4\sigma) = \lambda(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_3)^2 \delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\sigma}$ into the vertices of Fig.2. The calculation then yields

$$\Gamma_{a-c} = \frac{97m\lambda^2 p_F^4}{15\pi\hbar^2} \cos \theta (\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\sigma} + \delta_{\alpha\sigma}\delta_{\beta\gamma}). \quad (5)$$

The last diagram (Fig.2d) contains both $\log(\epsilon_F/T_c)$ and the contribution to the prefactor, and also contributes to the vacuum renormalization which transforms the interaction potential into the scattering amplitude [9]. The vacuum renormalization has to be subtracted from the diagram of Fig.2d. This procedure eliminates ultraviolet divergence in the theory leaving ϵ_F as the only dimensional quantity:

$$\Gamma_d = -\frac{f_1^2 m \hbar^2}{4\pi} \ln \left[\frac{2\epsilon_F \gamma}{\pi e T} \right] \cos \theta (\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\sigma} + \delta_{\alpha\sigma}\delta_{\beta\gamma}), \quad (6)$$

where $\ln \gamma$ is the Euler constant $C \approx 0.577$ and f_1 is the p-wave scattering amplitude, which in the Born approximation is equal to $-2\lambda p_F^2/\hbar^2$.

Expressing (5) in terms of f_1 and combining it with (6), we get the renormalized pairing interaction in the p-wave channel $\Gamma = \Gamma_{a-c} + \Gamma_d$ which includes both leading (logarithmic) and next to leading order terms in f_1 . The instability criterion then yields ($f_1 < 0$):

$$T_c = \frac{2\gamma\epsilon_F}{\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{112}{15}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{4\pi}{m|f_1|}\right). \quad (7)$$

While $2\gamma/\pi \approx 1.13$, the factor $\exp(-112/15) \approx 5.72 \cdot 10^{-4}$ reduces T_c in (7) by more than three orders of magnitude. As a result, even if the coupling constant $g_p = m|f_1|/4\pi \sim 1$, the critical temperature $T_c \sim 10^{-4}\epsilon_F$.

The results above were obtained in the Born approximation, i.e. under the assumption that the Born parameter $u \simeq \lambda m_3/4\pi r_0^2 \ll 1$. The validity of the Born approximation is, however, questionable for ^3He on Grafoil. Indeed, it follows from (3) that in the Born approximation the linear in density term in F_0^a is two times larger than that in F_1^s . However, the experimental results [1,3] give a much smaller value for this ratio. This suggests that the Born parameter is, in fact, not small and hence the density-independent (“vacuum”) corrections to the Fermi liquid parameters are important. We calculated the leading vacuum p-channel corrections in the symmetrical gauge and obtained

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^s &= \lambda m^* \rho \left(1 + \frac{9u}{4}\right), \\ F_0^a &= -2g - 2\lambda m^* \rho \left(1 - \frac{u}{4}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Since λ should be positive in order to account for the increase of m^*/m_3 with the density, vacuum corrections increase the linear term in F_1^s and reduce that in F_0^a which narrows the gap between theory and experiment. A fit to the experiment gives $u \sim 1-2$, that is the vacuum corrections are, indeed, strong (the uncertainty in u is related to the s-wave contribution to F_0^a which is difficult to estimate precisely).

The next step would be to calculate T_c beyond the Born approximation. However, we already mentioned that in order to solve the problem one needs to know what the renormalized scattering amplitudes are for all combinations of the momenta relevant to the diagrams of Fig.2. Such calculation is lengthy and not very informative because it is not clear

whether one can deal with only the leading term in u in the region of parameters relevant to the experiments. Because of this complication, below we use a more qualitative approach and just take into account the fact that the spin structure of the p-wave interaction potential does not survive the effect of vacuum renormalization, i.e. the total p-wave scattering amplitude has both spin-independent and spin-dependent parts even if the initial interaction was spin-independent. Accordingly, we model the effect of vacuum renormalization by introducing an effective potential which satisfies the Born approximation condition and has both spin-independent and spin-dependent parts [15]:

$$U_{eff} = U(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k})\delta_{\alpha\gamma}\delta_{\beta\sigma} + \bar{U}(\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k})\vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\gamma}\vec{\sigma}_{\beta\sigma}. \quad (9)$$

The low density expansion of $\bar{U}$ is $\bar{U}(\theta) = \bar{U}(0) + 2\bar{\lambda}p_F^2(1 - \cos\theta) + O(p_F^4)$. This effective potential reproduces measured $m^*(\rho)$ and $\chi(\rho)$ quite well for $\zeta = \bar{\lambda}/(\bar{\lambda} + \lambda) \approx 0.3 - 0.4$ (note much smaller uncertainty in ζ than in u).

The calculation of T_c with U_{eff} proceeds along the same lines as above. We skip the intermediate calculations and present only the result:

$$T_c = \frac{2\gamma\epsilon_F}{\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{112}{15} + \frac{56}{3}\zeta - \frac{308}{15}\zeta^2\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{g_p}\right). \quad (10)$$

The p-wave coupling constant now is

$$g_p = \frac{mp_F^2}{2\pi\hbar^2}(\lambda + \bar{\lambda}). \quad (11)$$

As it turns out, $\zeta = 0.3 - 0.4$, inferred from the fit to the experiment, corresponds to the prefactor $\bar{\epsilon}_F = 0.03 - 0.04\epsilon_F$. This value is larger than our earlier estimate though is still considerably smaller than the p-wave result in three dimensions, $0.1\epsilon_F$ [16]. It is worth mentioning here that for bulk ^3He the value of the prefactor inferred from the measured T_c was found to be rather insensitive to the particular form of the interaction [17].

In order to estimate T_c , we express the coupling constant g_p as

$$g_p = \frac{1 - m_3/m^*}{1 + 2\zeta}. \quad (12)$$

For small densities, $m^* \approx m_3$ and T_c is exponentially small. However, for moderate densities, m^* is significantly larger than the bare mass and the coupling constant saturates at the value $(1 + 2\zeta)^{-1} \approx 0.5-0.6$. Substituting this value of g_p into (10), we get $T_c \sim 5-7$ mK which is of the same order as $T_k \approx 3.2$ mK where the anomaly in the specific heat has been observed. Although the quantitative agreement with the experiment is unanticipated because of the approximate nature of the theoretical considerations, our results indicate that the dense “surface” ^3He on Grafoil may become superfluid in the experimentally accessible temperature range. Note that there is no true off-diagonal long range order in two dimensions, but the superfluid density is finite below the transition [18,19]. The actual Kosterlitz-Thouless transition temperature does not differ substantially from the “mean-field” T_c which we have calculated [19].

It is argued in [2] that the specific heat anomaly in ^3He on Grafoil at T_k is an intrinsic property of the fluid monolayer. The calculated value of T_c (10) is comparable with T_k , but, unlike T_k , it significantly drops down at low densities. We suggest that the density independence of T_k observed in the experiments may in fact be a result of a phase separation which accompanies the superfluid transition, that is for arbitrary density of ^3He there is an energetically stable superfluid dense phase of ^3He below T_k . This tentative scenario explains both the lack of density dependence in T_k and a rapid decrease of the specific heat below T_k .

To summarize, in this paper we have analysed the specific heat and susceptibility data for ^3He on Grafoil. We found that the p-wave component of the interaction between ^3He quasiparticles is dominant for all experimentally accessible areal densities of ^3He . This interaction is attractive and gives rise to a p-wave transition temperature which for the dense “surface” ^3He is estimated to be in the millikelvin temperature region. We suggest that ^3He on Grafoil may be superfluid below 3.2 mK where the anomaly in the specific heat has been observed.

We would like to thank L. Bruch, I. Engelbrecht, D. Frenkel, M. Gelfand, D.S. Greywall, C.J. Pethick, D. Pines, and M. Webb for useful discussions. This work has been supported

by NSF Grants DMR88-57228 and DMR88-17613.

REFERENCES

- [1] D.S. Greywall, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 1842 (1990).
- [2] D.S. Greywall and P.A. Busch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 64 (1990).
- [3] C.P. Lusher, B.P. Cowan, and J. Saunders, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2497 (1991).
- [4] R.H. Higley, D.T. Sprague, and R.B. Hallock, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 2570 (1989).
- [5] B.K. Bhattacharyya and F.M. Gasparini, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 2719 (1985).
- [6] P.W. Andreson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** 2306 (1990); see also P.C.E. Stamp, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 2180, 1992.
- [7] J.R. Engelbrecht and M. Randeria, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1032 (1990); J.R. Engelbrecht and M. Randeria, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3225 (1991); H. Fukuyama, Y. Hasegawa and O. Narikiyo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **60**, 2013 (1991).
- [8] A.J. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 331 (1975).
- [9] E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii, "Statistical Physics", part 2 (Pergamon, New York, 1980).
- [10] P. Bloom, Phys. Rev. **B12**, 125 (1975); L. Bruch, Physica **94A**, 586 (1978).
- [11] J.R. Engelbrecht, M. Randeria and L. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **B45**, 10135, 1992.
- [12] A.F. Andreev, Sov. Phys. JETP **23**, 939 (1966); D.O. Edwards and W.F. Saam, *Progress in Low Temperature Physics*, edited by D.F. Brewer, Vol. 7a, p.282 (1978, North Holland, Amsterdam).
- [13] Here we consider a pairing due to the p-wave component of the interaction. There is another p-wave contribution which is produced by the screening of the original quasiparticle interaction by the fermionic background (Kohn-Luttinger effect). This effect gives rise to the p-wave pairing in two dimensions when the dominant interaction is in the s-wave

channel [A.V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. B, in press], but is less important for ^3He on Grafoil, where the interaction potential has an already dominant p-wave component.

- [14] L.P. Gor'kov and T.K. Melik-Barkhudarov, Sov. Phys. JETP **13**, 1018 (1961).
- [15] This approach is similar in spirit to the pseudopotential approach by J. Bardeen, G.A. Baym, and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. B **156**, 207 (1967); see also K.S. Bedell and C.S. Castro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 854 (1986).
- [16] M.Yu. Kagan and A.V. Chubukov, Sov. Phys. JETP Lett. **47**, 614 (1988); see also M.A. Baranov, A.V. Chubukov and M.Yu. Kagan, Int. Journal of Mod. Phys. **B6**, 2471 (1992).
- [17] K.S. Bedell and D. Pines, Phys. Lett. **78A**, 281 (1980); B.R. Patton and A. Zaringhaleh, Phys. Lett. **55A**, 95 (1975).
- [18] J.M. Kosterlitz and D.J. Thouless, J. Phys C. **6**, 1181 (1973); see also S. Schmitt-Rink, C.M. Varma and A.E. Ruckenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 445 (1989); M. Randeria, J. Duan and L. Shieh, Phys. Rev, **B41**, 327 (1990).
- [19] V.N. Popov, Theor. Math. Phys. **11**, 565 (1972); D.S. Fisher and P.C. Hohenberg, Phys. Rev. **B37**, 4936 (1988).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. The density dependence of the effective mass for ${}^3\text{He}$ on Grafoil. The experimental data [1] is fitted using the interaction potential with dominant s-wave or p-wave amplitudes (dotted and dashed lines, respectively).

FIG. 2. Second order diagrams which contribute to the pairing vertex. The wavy line represents the interaction potential.